

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME IX

FEBRUARY 1914

NUMBER 5

Editorial

THE RECENT MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The forty-fifth annual meeting of the American Philological Association was held at Harvard University, December 29-31. The decision that this meeting should be held in conjunction with that of the Modern Language Association was a wise one, especially in this particular year when the report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature was to be presented. To many of our members it was undoubtedly a very considerable hardship that the Archaeological Association should meet this year in Montreal, although that meeting came on January 1-3. However, our interests are certainly more vitally allied with those of the Modern Language Association than with those of the Archaeological Association.

The combined attendance of the two associations amounted to more than 460 persons, of whom about 160 are members of the Philological Association. Three joint sessions of the Associations were held. At the first, on Monday evening, Professor Harold North Fowler delivered the annual address of the president of the Philological Association, a most valuable and scholarly paper on the subject: "The Present and Future of Classical Studies in the United States." The address was full of excellent suggestions and was admirably expressed. At the second, on Tuesday afternoon, various papers were given and Professor William Gardner Hale, chairman of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, presented this committee's report. At the third joint session, on Tuesday evening, the annual address of the president of the Modern Language Association was given by Professor Alexander R. Hohlfeld. His subject was: "Light from Goethe on Our

Problems." The paper was intensely interesting and charmingly presented. Professor Hohlfeld emphasized the fact that the interests of the ancient and of the modern languages are identical.

Of the many other papers on the program it is hardly necessary to speak. Lack of space prevents our mentioning them individually and they will all be published later, as a whole or in full summaries. It must be said, however, that the papers were all of the usual excellent quality and there seems to be no reason to fear a decline in American scholarship. There was no intemperate paper, like the one that marred the program at Washington last year. Discussion was full and free, and always in good spirit.

In addition to the fine papers, many other things served to make this a memorable meeting of the Association. The arrangements for the entertainment of nearly five hundred guests had been most carefully made by our colleagues on the Harvard faculty, and all of the plans were carried out with absolute precision. Here, too, the lack of space prevents even the mention of all the things that were done for us. After the address on Monday evening a most enjoyable reception was given to the members of both associations by Professor and Mrs. Herbert Weir Smyth and Professor and Mrs. George Lyman Kittredge, at the Harvard Union. On Tuesday afternoon we were all entertained at luncheon at the Harvard Union, as guests of the University Corporation. The address on Tuesday evening was followed by a delightful reception for the ladies by Mrs. Herbert Weir Smyth, at her residence, while the men were given a smoker at the Harvard Club in Boston. This last-mentioned event was regarded by nearly all, if not all, of the men as the finest feature of the whole meeting. The room was completely filled and for several short hours the company of nearly four hundred men enjoyed the pleasures of a real *convivium* as described so beautifully in the *De senectute*. Rev. Samuel M. Crothers, always a charming speaker and writer, gave a brilliant address, which was enthusiastically received. Each guest had been given a printed copy of the words of eight songs, in English, Latin, German, or French, and these songs were sung at intervals during the evening to the accompaniment of the Harvard Club's magnificent organ. Naturally the present writer most thoroughly enjoyed "Gaudeamus Igitur," "Integer Vitae," and "Drink to Me Only with Thine

Eyes"; but the instructors in French seemed to get most delight out of "Malbrouck," if one may judge from appearances!

Probably the privilege, given on Tuesday afternoon, of seeing Mrs. Gardner's remarkably fine collection of paintings and other works of art would be noted among the especial pleasures of the meeting by those who were fortunate enough to secure tickets of admission.

The most important business transacted on Wednesday afternoon concerned the report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature. As is well known, the committee has been working on this difficult problem for several years. Many meetings have been held in various cities by the committee and by the sub-committees. Our members of the committee have been in session 186 hours! A pamphlet of 65 pages, containing the committee's recommendations and explanations, was mailed to each member of the associations a week before the meeting. Inasmuch as no member had received his copy before starting for Cambridge additional copies were distributed on Tuesday afternoon. In his very brief remarks at the time of presenting the report Professor Hale said in part: "If you read the report, you will think that there was no discussion. If you had heard the discussions, you would have thought there could be no report! The Committee of Fifteen, chosen from the entire country, has come to a perfect agreement, except on a very few minor matters. The work yet remaining to be done is chiefly a matter of the writing of a brief history of the movement and of preparing an index. No change in the body of the report is contemplated."

At the business meeting there was a prolonged discussion and many suggestions were made and amendments to motions offered, not to mention substitute motions! At last the Association voted, as follows:

1. That the report of the joint committee be received and that the committee be continued.
2. That the committee be requested to complete the report and to provide for its publication.
3. That the Association express its sense of the desirability of uniformity of grammatical terminology in the work of the schools, and recommend that the schools follow the general lines

of the report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature, with the understanding that this recommendation does not carry with it approval of all the terms proposed in the report. No individual term was mentioned in the discussion.

It should be noted also that the Modern Language Association had previously passed resolutions to the same general effect and without reservation of any kind.

At the conclusion of this, the Committee on Nominations recommended the election of the following officers for the coming year and they were accordingly elected: President, Professor Edward Capps, Princeton University; Vice-Presidents, Professor Carl Darling Buck, University of Chicago, Professor Edward Parmelee Morris, Yale University; Secretary and Treasurer, Professor Frank Gardner Moore, Columbia University; Executive Committee, the above-named officers, and Professor Charles Knapp, Barnard College, Professor Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan, Professor John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Professor Kirby Flower Smith, Johns Hopkins University, Professor Arthur L. Wheeler, Bryn Mawr College.

Professor Moore then announced that two definite invitations have been received for the next annual meeting. After some discussion it was voted that the whole question of time and place of the next meeting be left to the Executive Committee with power. At the meeting in Washington a year ago many members expressed the desire that we might occasionally meet by ourselves. The same wish was often voiced at Harvard, though not at the business meeting. If this is done, our meeting will naturally be much smaller and we shall miss the deep inspiration such as that which we have just received from meeting with the Modern Language Association and from getting to know its members and its ideals. This gain alone would have made the meeting in Cambridge more than worth while, even without the privilege of listening to the papers and the enjoyment of Harvard's magnificent hospitality. The value, however, of a deeper acquaintance, gained by really living together for three days at some small college, would be great, and the time for such a meeting may be at hand.

M. N. W.

THE PRESENTATION OF CLASSICAL PLAYS¹

PART I

BY D. D. HAINS
Wabash College

For three decades the presentation of classical plays has been a great factor in the effort to show the value of the "humanities" in our educational scheme. And we are compelled to prove this in this day and generation. This is an age of "utilitarianism," and in many respects it is rightly so. We all glory in the immense advancement along material lines that our country has made in the past century, and we agree with those who demand a change in the curricula of our schools to keep pace with this advancement. There is a place for domestic science, for manual training, for agriculture, and for the sciences. These subjects have come to stay, and especially so in the case of those students who do not intend to go farther than the secondary schools. We have no quarrel with those who advocate the so-called "modern" subjects, but we do claim that these should go hand in hand with studies which have a purely cultural value, and we, as champions of such training, must show that it has real tangible worth. We may talk platitudes by the hour. We may make as many claims as we wish for the value of our courses, but the ordinary citizen is "from Missouri" and wants to be "shown." And I know of no better method of "showing" him than by the presentation of one of the masterpieces of Greek drama. Many of you are looking forward to a class play this year. Try a tragedy of Sophocles or Euripides instead of the traditional Shakspeare. Other high-school teachers have done so with great success, both in the effect produced on their audiences and their classes and from a financial standpoint, and the results have more than paid for all the time and labor expended. I would urge especially the presentation of Greek plays: their appeal is so

¹ Read before the Classical Section of the Illinois University High-School Conference, November 21, 1913.

universal that they bridge the chasm of the centuries and arouse interest, not merely as spectacles of past grandeur, but as living works of art, which move to sympathy and to tears as strongly as the work of the latest dramatist of the twentieth century.

I have been asked to discuss today some of the more notable performances of classical plays—and it is possible to take up only a few in the time allotted me—and also the questions of choosing a cast, costuming, training, etc. This is a large subject for a single paper and the treatment of each section will, necessarily, be brief. The first part will be confined almost exclusively to the Greek drama, but what may be said in regard to technique of presentation, costuming, and staging will apply equally well to Latin plays and dramatizations.

Thirty-two years ago—to be exact, on the seventeenth of May, 1881—the first Greek play ever given in America was staged at Sanders Theater, Harvard University. The play was the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, the greatest of Greek tragedies, the crowning work of the inimitable artist, Sophocles. The interest created by this performance both at home and abroad was very great and its success remarkable. The theater was filled to its greatest capacity for five nights, the tickets, with an original value of two dollars, were sold by speculators for ten or fifteen, and Holmes, Emerson, Howells, Longfellow, and other famous men of letters were in the audience and were all deeply impressed by the solemn and stately performance. This was the starting-point, the entering wedge in the reproduction of classical drama, and the success of such presentations in the years that have elapsed since this beginning has proved the wisdom of those who inaugurated the classic revival in this country.

The extent of the movement can be seen from the statistics of the productions. The number, both of plays and institutions, is surprisingly large. This investigation has aimed to be as thorough as possible and the returns seem to be practically complete. Greek plays have been given by 49 colleges and universities, 6 secondary schools, and 8 clubs: the number of plays is 125; of separate performances, 193. Latin plays have been given by 29 colleges and universities and 4 secondary schools: the number of plays is 45; of performances, 48. And 52 institutions have given dramatiza-

tions from Greek and Latin—from Homer, Theocritus, Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil. This makes a grand total of 300 performances of 228 plays and dramatizations by 130 institutions. Please note that this does not include professional productions, Roman dinners and entertainments, and the numerous presentations of Miss Paxson's Latin playlets, a *Roman School* and a *Roman Wedding*, which have served to arouse interest in Latin at many schools and colleges. These figures show how widely the movement has spread. It has extended from Massachusetts on the east to California on the west, and from Maine on the north to Louisiana on the south. The audiences have varied so largely in size, from a mere handful at a classical club to five thousand at Harvard and eight thousand at the University of California, that it is impossible to estimate the number of individuals who have been present at these productions and have felt the thrill of the classic author's artistic touch. And such dramas as the *Oedipus*, *Antigone*, *Alcestis*, *Medea*, do produce a genuine dramatic effect, even when played by amateurs. I shall always remember the closing scene of the *Oedipus* at Wabash, when the audience sat in tense silence, every eye fixed on the stage, as the blind king, weighed down by the burden of the terrible revelation that had just come to him, bade a tender farewell to his two little daughters. It was literally true that "there was hardly a dry eye in the house," for the whole audience, men and women alike, were moved to tears.

And now to take up a few performances which, for one reason or another, would seem of especial interest. The *Oedipus* at Harvard is notable, not only as the first, but as one of the finest renditions ever given in this country. Mr. Norman says of it in the *Book of the Harvard Greek Play*:

The play is a masterpiece of classic tragedy; it was produced under the auspices and within the precincts of a great university; each detail of the presentation was in charge of men known for exact scholarship and literary taste; difficulty and expense were alike disregarded in the effort to give an impressive reproduction of an Athenian performance; seven months were spent in preparation. The play was witnessed by six thousand people; on the occasion of the first performance, by an audience which, for literary distinction, has probably never been equaled in America; many persons were unable to obtain seats, although ten times the original price was freely offered; it was reported

by every considerable newspaper in the country, and the news was not only telegraphed to Europe, but was even inserted in the local papers there.

The success of the play was remarkable. Two short extracts from Boston papers of the day will give an excellent idea of the effect produced by it. The *Journal* says:

The first public performance of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles last evening was also the first performance of this play in its original language in recent times, and the first presentation of a Greek drama in this country. The event was therefore interesting for its novelty, as well as for its dramatic and scholastic importance. Its success was pronounced and instant, and indeed it may be doubted if a Greek play has ever been so thoroughly well presented since the times and audiences for which it was originally written. . . . The production was a perfect one in every detail, being thoroughly consistent, dignified, strong, and fully accordant in earnest spirit with all we have heretofore conceived of the realities of the Greek stage. . . . It is an increasing matter of marvel to all who will consider it, that this play has ever been produced, even with the great resources at the command of Harvard College.

And the *Evening Traveller* says:

The performance of the *Oedipus*, last night, brought delight to an immense and critical audience, and was a surprise, as we are disposed to think, even to those who expected most. A distinguished scholar was heard to say to a friend, as the great assembly broke up—almost unwillingly—that it was in itself an education to have witnessed the spectacle. That was the feeling certainly among the great body of the audience. They knew, for the first time, what classical tragedy is, and entered, for the first time, into the temper and enthusiasm of the people who in its day applauded it so eagerly.

In addition to minor performances of the *Birds* of Aristophanes and the *Epitrepontes* of Menander, Harvard staged one other Greek play on a magnificent scale, the *Agamemnon* in 1906. The stadium, in which the play was given, presented some difficulties on account of its size: it is two hundred and thirty feet broad inside, almost three times the width of the theater at Oropus, which was taken for a model. In order to fill this space the stage building, representing the palace of Agamemnon, was lengthened out to one hundred and thirty feet and a wooden wall was built at each end to occupy the blank space. The palace was splendid in architecture and coloring: the plain façade with its Doric columns was a deep, rich cream shading into brown; the metopes were a dull red, and the triglyphs a bright blue; the metopes over the door were sculp-

tured with scenes from the battle of the Centaurs and the Lapiths, the central door, copied from the Treasury of Atreus, was of dark green copper; lions' heads of gold ornamented the cornice, and the acroteria were painted in conventional designs in red, blue, and gold. The whole color scheme was wonderfully beautiful and formed a harmonious background that contrasted finely with the green grass of the orchestra and the tints of the actors' costumes. The theory of Dörpfeld was adopted by the committee after some hesitation. Mr. Paul More, literary editor of the *Nation*, comments on the stage question as follows:

The theory of Dörpfeld proved itself indubitably correct. No one, it should seem, could see the effects thus produced without feeling the utter impossibility of visualizing a Greek tragedy on an elevated stage. The tableaux formed by the relative position of chorus and actors were no small part of the dramatic effect at Cambridge, and these would have been lost entirely with the old idea of the theater. The scene on the stage (if the acting arena may be so called) was imposing and beautiful, and the color scheme particularly would have been, under a clear sky, rich and harmonious. There was an evident intention to combat the common notion of Greek life as colorless and coldly statuesque.

Of the performance itself a correspondent in the *Indianapolis News* writes:

The whole play was a delight to a student of drama. The fresh, strong voices of the young actors made the Greek sentences ring out clear and distinct. They phrased their sentences intelligently and acted excellently. The pity and terror that Aristotle regarded as the essential elements of tragedy were finely brought out by the contrasting rôles of Cassandra and Clytemnestra. Agamemnon was truly a "king of men," and Aegisthus was handsome and vain, an excellent foil to the tigerish energy of the queen. The costumes exhibited the same careful attention to archaeological detail. The chorus wore white tunics, with overcloaks of color, some purple and some blue. The Argive soldiers wore red tunics and golden armor, with the snake of the house of Atreus on their shields. The Phrygian captives wore the characteristic cap and long trousers and sleeves, familiar in Greek sculptures. Agamemnon was in full war panoply, with the nodding horsehair crest of the Homeric heroes. Clytemnestra's gown was of white and gold, with a splendid overrobe of purple and silver. Her hair was filleted with gold, and her bracelets and ornaments were exact reproductions of the discoveries of Schliemann in the Mycenaean tombs. Cassandra's red-gold hair, that betrayed to her angry mistress her barbaric origin, was bound with green, and her dress was of pale green with a silver overdrapery. The chariots were notably handsome, with the long pole

and yoke. The horses might have been taken from the Parthenon frieze. They were a light roan, spirited, stocky little fellows, with long tails and very shortly clipped manes. The whole performance was a revelation—so accurate in its wealth of archaeological material, such a shifting of gorgeous colors and stage pictures, and especially such a great drama from the literary point of view, that it was a tremendous testimonial to the vitality of Greek literature. So great and so universal was the Greek creative genius that today a modern audience will sit for three hours in the rain, listening spell-bound to a play two thousand years old.

As Harvard is noted for the first presentation of a Greek play in this country and for the magnificence of its productions, so Beloit is famed for the number of its plays—more than twice as many as have been given by any other institution. Professor Wright is certainly correct when he says: "Our little town has seen more Greek plays than any other city in America." In addition to staging the greatest number of plays, twenty-one, Beloit also originated the idea of presenting them in English, an innovation that has been adopted almost universally. And rightly so. The spectator who does not know Greek, and that is true of almost all, sees only the spectacle. He misses much of the dramatic effect, the delicate shading, that a thorough comprehension of the lines would give him; he does not feel the sensations of the Greek who sat in the Dionysiac Theater, following every word with intense interest and lively delight. We attempt to move our audiences as they were moved twenty-three centuries ago, to produce the same effects, to arouse the same emotions. To do this in a language which is absolutely unknown to the great majority and with which the remainder, in most cases, have only a reading acquaintance, is practically impossible. With us at Wabash it would not be a difficult task to commit the Greek in the four or five months spent in rehearsals each year, but the results, I feel sure, would not compensate for the labor. In fact, I am convinced that we would fail to a very large extent in achieving our object—to make Greek tragedy *live* again upon the stage.

The Beloit plays were at first very simple affairs, mere parlor readings with no costumes and little attempt at acting from 1885 to 1888. The performance of 1889 was given in an old stone quarry, the players wore "himatia" improvised from sheets, and the lines

were "read" with more care. From that time the process of evolution was rapid: stage, scenery, costumes, acting, music, all received due attention, and the place of performance was transferred to the college chapel and later to a theater. Another original feature of the Beloit plays is the translation in metrical form made by the Sophomore class, which has charge each year. In some cases the versions of former classes have been revised and for the last thirteen years librettos have been published for the plays. All in all, the series of Greek plays at Beloit has been a most pronounced success and reflects great credit on Professor Wright, who has had charge of all except the earliest performances.

In the far West, Leland Stanford Junior University was the first to follow the example set by Harvard. Sophocles' *Antigone* was the play chosen for presentation, four months were spent in preparation, and seven performances were given at Leland Stanford, at the State University, and in the cities of Southern California. The results can best be seen from the following extract from Mr. Rolfe's *Book of the Play*. He says:

The impression made by the play upon the audience seemed to be the same at every performance. The interest was intense, the emotion deep. Every one was too much moved for frequent applause. All, even to the children present, were absorbed by the beauty of the costumes and stage pictures and acting and music and choral evolutions. At the end, as the chorus marched from sight, the audience rose and left the place, it seemed, with much the feeling with which the Greeks must have risen on the slopes of the Acropolis, lifting their eyes to the familiar landscape once more, from the spot where, during the morning hours, they had seen only Antigone and Creon and the woes of the house of Labdacus. The final outcome of the play has been a remarkable intensification, throughout the university and in many preparatory schools and high schools, of respect for classical studies and interest in them.

The only Greek theater at an institution of learning in the United States is also found in California, at the State University. Its construction was made possible through the generosity of Mr. Hearst, and the work was completed in 1903. Advantage was taken of a natural hollow in the hillside which had been used for university entertainments, a temporary stage being constructed, while the spectators sat under the shade of the great eucalyptus trees. The material used in its construction was concrete and the

general plan is that of the theater at Epidauros. It is hardly half as large as the Dionysiac Theater at Athens, yet it seats comfortably an audience of eight thousand. The acoustics are exceptionally good. A chautauqua lecturer, who has spoken in every state in the Union, tells me that he has never addressed an audience of anything like the size with so little effort. The stage building with its Doric columns and simple entablature is impressive. The stage itself is Roman, not Greek, and from its width causes some embarrassment in the production of a Greek play, as Professor Allen informs me. In fact, in the *Eumenides* both actors and chorus made use of the stage, neglecting the orchestra entirely. The theater was dedicated September 24, 1903, by a presentation of the *Birds* of Aristophanes, which was witnessed by a crowd that filled the auditorium to its fullest capacity. The *Ajax* was given the following year and in 1907, the *Eumenides*. All were well done but the last was the most successful of the three. In it especial attention was paid to training the cast and chorus and to the staging of the play. Professor Allen took the part of Orestes, an exceedingly difficult rôle, because Orestes speaks so little and yet must portray the deepest emotion throughout long scenes in which he does not utter a word. This part Professor Allen carried so well that the audience was deeply moved. It mattered little that they knew no Greek—Orestes spoke in a language that needed no interpreter. In 1910 the university celebrated the Golden Jubilee of the College of California, the institution from which it sprang. The most important part of the program from the classicist's point of view was the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, which was given in English by a cast of faculty members and students before an immense concourse of alumni and friends of the institution.

I cannot refrain from mentioning two other plays in the Greek Theater, although they were not college performances, the *Antigone* and the *Electra* of Sophocles, the former in 1910, the latter only a couple of months ago. In both, Miss Margaret Anglin took the title rôles, supported by a professional company. Both were magnificently staged and splendidly acted.

Another play which approached professional perfection was the *Choephori*, the second play given by the American Academy of

Dramatic Arts of New York City, the oldest and most prominent school of acting in America. The cast was made up of members of the Senior class who were ready for their début on the stage and who celebrated their graduation into the ranks of the profession by this performance. The greatest attention was given to dancing and to stage effects: the chorus was drilled for five months in its dances and poses. All the New York critics spoke in terms of the highest praise of the *Choephoroi*. The dramatic editor of the *Post* said: "The evolutions and attitudes of the chorus were dignified and rhythmical and exceedingly effective." The *Times* calls the *Choephoroi* "a most commendable undertaking. The groupings were handled with unusual skill, and the eye was constantly being pleased with graceful and melting pictures." The *Globe* says: "The setting, the music, the costumes, the dances were all artistically handled." Such results were expected by all who were acquainted with President Sargent's devotion to the classic drama. His influence has been felt for a generation: he assisted in producing the Harvard *Oedipus*; he trained the principals in the first professional company to put on a Greek play, that of Daniel Frohman at New York in 1881; and he acted as stage manager for the Smith College *Electra*, the Vassar *Antigone*, and for a large number of club performances. It is only just to express our obligation to him for the assistance he has given the cause of the classics. Probably no one man in the United States has done more for classic drama than President Sargent.

One other university performance of high quality deserves to be mentioned, that of the *Iphigenia among the Taurians* at the University of Pennsylvania in 1903, the second at that institution. (The first was the *Acharnians* in 1886, the earliest attempt to stage a Greek comedy in this country.) Pennsylvania has neither an open-air theater nor a place, like the Sanders Theater at Harvard, peculiarly adapted by its architecture to the performance of a Greek play. Accordingly use was made of a public auditorium, the Academy of Music, the largest theater in Philadelphia. The leading character in the *Iphigenia* is a woman and the chorus is made up of captured Greek maidens who have become the servants of the priestess.

In every modern performance of a Greek play [writes a correspondent of the *Boston Transcript*] it is a long and difficult task to train the actors to speak the verses with fluency, intelligence, and rhythmic precision, and then to add thereto some understanding of their dramatic content and some skill in the imparting of it. All the parts fall to men of little or no theatrical experience. Under these conditions, to compass moving illusions for an audience listening to a strange speech and watching an unfamiliar procedure on the stage is no slight achievement. It becomes still more considerable and creditable when a chief element in that illusion is a semblance of womanhood and of womanly emotion in a protagonist and a chorus that are really young men. Happily, to spectators with a little Greek and a little imagination, the students that played Iphigenia and her attendant maidens came close to this illusion. . . . By all outward tokens familiar to experienced observers, the audience . . . in large measure a picked one . . . followed the progress of the drama with absorbed interest. With the appearance of Orestes and Pylades on their quest for the divine image, the listeners began to catch the romantic savor of the drama and the atmosphere of heroic and much-tried youth that permeates it. The entrance of the chorus and its lyric lament with Iphigenia over Orestes' memory added picturesque and poetic appeal. The long speech of the herdsman stirred an audience that still knows and appreciates its Shakspeare enough to yield naturally to vivid dramatic narrative. Then through the long scene between Orestes, Pylades, and Iphigenia, culminating in the mutual recognition of brother and sister, the interest of the audience steadily mounted, bursting at the climax into an inevitable and relieving applause. Here were real human beings, not the demi-gods of Aeschylus nor the highly spiritualized personages of Sophocles, in a situation of piercing dramatic power handled with what dramatic and theatric skill! (Of how many moderns in their treatment of character and episode did Euripides seem at the moment the fertile father!)

[To be continued]

THE IMPEACHMENTS OF VERRES AND HASTINGS: CICERO AND BURKE

BY H. V. CANTER
University of Illinois

General readers as well as students of the Verrine orations have often felt the comparison suggested by the impeachment proceedings against Verres, the corrupt governor of Sicily, and the celebrated trial of Warren Hastings, arraigned for misrule, extortion, and cruelty practiced while governor-general of India. Forsyth¹ indicates their degree of resemblance thus: "This . . . the great Verres cause, which of all the trials of antiquity bears in many of its circumstances the nearest resemblance to the impeachment of Warren Hastings." Farther on² Forsyth, commenting on Verres' attempt to delay his trial, suggests a particular point of resemblance: "The impeachment would drag its slow length along, and men would begin to get tired of it, as was the case with the trial of Warren Hastings." Macaulay likewise in his essay on Hastings says in describing the scene of the trial:³ "There the historian of the Roman empire thought of the days when Cicero pleaded the cause of Sicily against Verres." Further, that the similarity of the two proceedings was appreciated by educated men at the time of Hastings' trial may be seen from the words of Lord Erskine,⁴ counsel for John Stockdale who was defended (December, 1789) on a charge of libel immediately connected with Hastings' impeachment: "When Cicero impeached Verres before the great tribunal of Rome of similar cruelties and depredations in her provinces . . . it was not by the eloquence of the orator, but by the cries and tears of the miserable that Cicero prevailed in that illustrious case. Verres fled from the oaths of his accusers

¹ *Life of Cicero*, New York, 1865, p. 56.

² *Ibid.*, p. 63.

³ *Essays*, Riverside Press, V, 126.

⁴ *Speeches*, edited by High, Chicago, 1876, II, 44.

and their witnesses, and not from the voice of Tully." So editors of Cicero have, in a general way, pointed out resemblances in the trials. Tyrrell¹ has in mind the opposing counsel: "To gain Cicero [as counsel] was what it would be now to secure the advocacy of the *Times* . . . and were the leaders of the *Times* written by Burke or Sheridan." Allen and Greenough² make the speeches a basis of comparison: "The prosecution in this [Hastings'] case (and in particular Burke) seem to have modelled their speeches on the Verrine orations."

That Burke kept the Verres prosecution ever before him seems clear. He makes aptly against Hastings the identical retort that Cicero made against Verres' counsel Hortensius. To the latter who had accepted from Verres a bronze image of the Sphinx, and who once in the cross-examination of a witness exclaimed, "I do not understand your riddles," Cicero said: "Well, you ought to since you have a sphinx at your house."³ In like manner, to Hastings' plea in extenuation of his course in India that he had no men of law, no legal assistance to supply his deficiencies, Burke rejoined:⁴ *At Sphingem habebas domi*. Further, all doubt that Burke realized he was following Cicero as a prosecutor, and that he regarded him as his model, is put aside when we come to his remarks on the *Verrines*:⁵ "We have all, in our early education, read the Verrine orations. We read them not merely to instruct us, as they will do, in the principles of eloquence . . . but we may read them from a much higher motive . . . a motive which the great orator had doubtless in his view, when by publishing them he left to the world and to the latest posterity a monument by which it might be seen what course a great public accuser in a great public cause ought to pursue, and, as connected with it, what course judges ought to pursue in deciding upon such a cause. In these orations you will find almost every instance of rapacity and speculation which we charge upon Mr. Hastings."

¹ *Correspondence of Cicero*, I, Introd., 14.

² *Orations and Letters of Cicero*, 1902, p. 235.

³ See Quint. vi. 3. 98; Pliny *N.H.* xxxiv. 8. 48.

⁴ *Speech in Opening*, Second Day.

⁵ *Speech in Reply*, Ninth Day.

Recently, however, I observed while reading the *Verrines* one authority¹ who emphasizes the differences in the two trials. He says: "How could one compare or deem the same the pretor of Sicily and the Verres of India? How confuse the selfish passions of the one with the pitiless, but patriotic energy of the other? Everything is different in these two trials, their duration, their issue, the political circumstances under which they took place, the rank, the talent, the number of the orators who prosecuted the charges." This view suggested a more detailed examination of the two prosecutions, for the purpose of determining better their resemblances and differences, and whether there exists sufficient similarity in the order and form of Burke's speeches, in the arguments presented, and in matters of style to conclude that they were modeled on the *Verrines* of Cicero. And we may say at once that, although it is impossible to conclude with Thomas that everything in the two trials is different, they do present striking differences as well as similarities. Some of these are noted by Holm,² who thinks that the modern throws considerable light on the great trial of antiquity.

First as to the two men. Both Verres and Hastings had been honored with positions of responsibility and authority. Both were charged with peculation, bribery, injustice, oppression, inhuman cruelty, tyranny, murder. Verres' name is a synonym for misrule, his private life another term for monstrous impurity. His memory no one has ever seriously thought of rescuing from execration. No defender of Verres has ever arisen unless we regard as a defense such observations as that of DeQuincey, that Verres suffered by the "masquerade of misrepresentation which invariably accompanied the political eloquence of Rome."³ With respect to Hastings, opinion has shifted from time to time, and although his public career will probably never cease to be a subject of controversy, against his private character calumny has scarcely breathed a reproach.

In both trials an immense mass of criminality was collected,

¹ Émile Thomas, *Discours de Cicéron contre Verres*, Paris, 1885, Introd., p. 10.

² *Geschichte Siciliens im Alterthum*, Leipzig, 1898, III, 439 f.

³ *Collected Writings*, ed. by Masson, VI, 181.

Verres
digested, and presented by the prosecution. Verres' trial was conducted with dispatch. Of the one hundred and ten days allowed Cicero by the court to collect the evidence and prepare the case (*Act. Sec. i. 11. 30*) he used but fifty, and the trial itself lasted but nine days. Verres, whose only defense was in delay, seeing an adverse verdict, voluntarily went into exile. On the other hand Burke and his associates spent fourteen years in the preparation of their case, and for seven years Hastings was on his defense charged with "high crimes and misdemeanors." He was ably and resolutely defended by counsel, and was acquitted by the House of Lords. Neither during the trial nor afterward did Hastings waver in his conviction and contention that his policy was politically expedient and morally right.

The court proceedings and scenes at these trials afford a striking contrast. Details are at hand only for the modern trial; for the other they must be reconstructed. In that of Verres the scene was probably the forum, especially that part known as the comitium, with the pretor presiding as judge, and attended by his lictors. The orators spoke in the open with the attendant disadvantages of sunshine and wind. Only in inclement weather was court held in a basilica. A mingled throng doubtless attended the trial. Everybody, high or low, rich or poor, had entrance, if he wished. The roofs of the adjoining buildings on such occasions were filled with the curious, with their outbursts of approval or disapproval. Different from this is the scene in the other trial, a scene among the most dramatic in the world's history, and one made clear by Macaulay and the biographers of Hastings. It was no ordinary court, but an impeachment by the Commons before the House of Lords. The place was the famous old Hall of Westminster built by William II, in which English kings had been crowned, and in which the trials of Lord Bacon, of Stafford, and of Charles I had taken place. There were present some of the noblest and most distinguished personages of England. Thus it will be noted that the outer picture of the two trials is different; that Hastings' trial was far less public than that of Verres, and the whole was so arranged that only the distinguished and the wealthy could enjoy the drama. Further, in the Verres trial witnesses

were placed on the stand. In Westminster Hall on the other hand we have the brilliant speeches of advocates. In short, at Rome a real trial, life itself; in London a full-dress rehearsal, a copy of life for elegant people.

In the talent and temper of the prosecutors, if not in their number, there is similarity. Against Verres was Cicero, the ablest young lawyer of his day, noted for his forensic skill, and an adept in the use of invective. Arrayed against Hastings and in the very height of their powers were the greatest orators of England at that time: Fox, known as the English Demosthenes, Sheridan their Hyperides, and Burke, who may very well be compared to Cicero, and to whom Cicero was ever the mightiest of ancient names. Like Cicero he never failed in the apt use of quotation and classical allusion. Besides numerous proverbial phrases one may readily detect in his speeches quotations from the *Iliad*, from the *Aeneid* and the *Eclogues* of Vergil, from Horace's *Odes* and *Satires*, from Ovid, Sallust, and Tacitus. He makes reference to the story of Medea and Absyrtus when speaking of Hastings' acts of bribery: "So that it is almost impossible to make up a complete body of all his bribery: You may find the scattered limbs, some here and others there; and while you are employed in picking them up he may escape entirely in a prosecution for the whole."¹ But the master whose pages Burke turned by day and by night was the fluent, versatile author of the invectives against Verres and Antony, of the speeches for Archias and for Milo. Cicero's deepest sympathies were with the wronged and oppressed Sicilians, and their oppressor he denounced with vehement indignation and relentless severity. So Burke's blood fairly boiled in his veins at the story of Hastings' crimes in India. We must go back to ancient times to find a parallel to the passionate and sustained indignation, the fiery intensity of crimination which time and again burst from the lips of the great leader of Hastings' impeachment.

Holm² contrasts the effect left on the reader of the speeches. After reading the *Verrines* and allowing for rhetorical exaggeration, he says, one feels from the tone that Cicero is right, and that Verres was a common scoundrel. On the other hand, in the speeches

¹ *Speech in Opening*, Third Day.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 443.

against Hastings one gets the impression that many things are exaggerated and distorted, and that for some of the accusations no real ground was at hand. That Burke and his colleagues spoiled their cause by overdoing it is clear. However, the different effect left on the reader arises less from the tone of the speeches, which is very similar, than from the personal character of the defendants as shown in the charges. Nor can we accept without modification Holm's conclusion that, whereas the prosecution of Verres was a brilliant and noble achievement, that of Hastings will ever stand in history as a conspicuous blunder.

Again the two trials offer a comparison in that each involved political questions. Verres' prosecution was undertaken with the direct support of the democratic consuls, Pompey and Crassus. It was thus in effect an attack on the oligarchic administration of the provinces; further, it was a warning to the Senate that Verres' acquittal would cost them their exclusive and corrupt control of the jury courts given to them by Sulla's legislation, i.e., that two-thirds of the panels would henceforth be chosen from non-senatorial ranks. In that of Hastings politics played at least a secondary part, as India's affairs were ever involved in party struggles. The Whig party was unanimous in following Burke's lead, but the exact motive which induced Pitt to incline the ministerial majority to the same side remains one of the secrets of history.¹

So in the results of the trials for the governmental systems of Rome and England. Doubtless Verres differed less from the average Roman governor in his acts than in the fate which overtook him. But his prosecution revealed as never before the frightful iniquities of Rome's system, and if it wrought no immediate improvement it marked at least the dawning of a better day for the provincials. Further, while the trial was still in progress, lack of public confidence in the senatorial juries was so pronounced that the Aurelian law was passed, insuring more impartial juries, composed equally of senators, knights, and common citizens. It is impossible to agree with Holm in his assertion that nothing was accomplished by Hastings' trial; that as his acquittal sanctioned his acts, none of his successors felt obliged to refrain from similar

¹ See Morley, *Burke*, London, 1907, pp. 184, 191.

conduct; that through mere lapse of time humanity in India came to be valued. Nor is this the judgment of history. Robertson,¹ after commending Hastings' political career, says: "But both his difficulties, his mistakes, and his splendid achievements combined to point an unmistakable moral. A legislative reconstruction of the fabric of the government of India and a revision of the powers of the chartered company were matters that statesmen at home could no longer burke." So Morley² speaks of the effect of the impeachment: "If he [Burke] did not convict the man, he overthrew a system, and stamped its principles with lasting censure and shame. . . . The lesson of his impeachment had been taught . . . the great lesson that Asiatics have rights and that Europeans have obligations."

A like difficulty faced the accusers of Verres and Hastings in that upon these governors was laid a financial as well as an executive duty. Verres had to see that the tithes were sent to Rome by the *decumani*, or tax-farmers. Hastings was obliged to secure large sums of money to pay dividends to the East India Company. Though difficult to do, it was expedient for the prosecution to throw all the guilt upon the governors. Burke does this by ignoring the fact that Hastings was the victim of his position; that he was directly responsible, not to the British government, but to a greedy trading company frankly interested in making money. Cicero is particularly adroit in meeting the difficulty. The *decumani* in Sicily were in many ways as guilty as Verres. But Cicero spared them, attacking only a few notoriously bad characters. This not only on account of their being fellow-knights, but because of the political situation. The judicial office, as it seemed, would soon be given over to them and they would wield a great power in the state, hence he deemed it best not to irritate this important class, who held the balance of power between the senatorial and democratic parties.

So much for the general resemblances and differences. Space is not available for the many striking analogies in the charges, in the methods of corruption and tyranny, and in the agencies through

¹ *England under the Hanoverians*, London, 1911, p. 293.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 195.

which criminal acts were carried out. These will be evident to anyone who reads the speeches of Cicero and Burke.

The order and outward form of the speeches show similarity. The *Actio Prima* of the *Verrines* is given up almost entirely to an exhortation to the judges, to whom Cicero explains the course he intends to follow (chaps. 11-13), and the kind of evidence that is to be offered (chaps. 11, 18). Further, specific charges are brought (chaps. 4, 5, 18) of crimes that are particularized in the succeeding speeches. So Burke's opening speech contains a statement of the plan already followed and to be followed by the prosecution, with an explanation of the matters to be presented in regular charges along with the evidence. Further, the opening speech characterizes the criminal, and indicates the nature of the evidence brought to support the charges.

Similar is the form in which the conclusions of the closing speeches are cast. Cicero ends both the first and second pleadings with an appeal to the court, and a discussion of every factor—case, criminal, prosecutor, tribunal—necessary to insure a just verdict (*Act. Prim.*, chap. 17; *Act. Sec.* v. 67-71). In like manner Burke appeals to the tribunal at the close of the *Speech in Opening*, and *Speech in Reply*. This similar appeal is followed by very similar perorations. Cicero (*Act. Sec.* v. 72) employs a twelve-fold anaphora, in which he combines charges against Verres and an invocation to the injured and offended divinities, whose names, attributes, and powers he implores as a guiding influence on the judges in rendering their decision. So Burke makes an effective use of anaphora in a twelve-fold repetition, summing up the charges against Hastings (*Speech in Opening*, Fourth Day). This is followed by the same figure used six times in combining an appeal to the authority on which the impeachment is brought with charges of outrages done against each authority so named.

Many resemblances are noticeable in the arguments advanced. The central thought of the *Actio Prima* is that the public is watching; that it is not Verres who is on trial, but the senatorial courts, from which power will be wrested and given to others. This Cicero forces home again and again (cf. *Act. Prim.* chaps. 15-16; *Act. Sec.* v. 69). Burke makes the same point:¹ "I confess I

¹ *Speech in Reply*, First Day.

tremble when I consider that your judgment is going to be passed, not on the culprit at your bar, but upon the House of Commons itself, and upon the public justice of this kingdom, as represented in this great tribunal. It is not the culprit who is upon trial; it is the House of Commons that is upon its trial." Further, the people prefer no courts at all to courts that are corrupt. Cicero argues (*Act. Prim.* chap. 14) that the acquittal of Verres would be subversive of the whole judicial system; that foreign nations will be sending ambassadors to Rome to procure the abrogation of the law about extortion, since it serves only to treble the extortion practiced, i.e., that while they might be able to satisfy the cupidity of one avaricious man (the governor), they are quite unable to bear the expense of his guilty victory over the laws (his acquittal by corrupt judges). So Burke:¹ "If from any appearance of chicane in the court justice should fail, men will say better there were no tribunals at all. In my humble opinion it would be better a thousand times to give all complainants the short answer the Dey of Algiers gave a British ambassador, representing certain grievances suffered by British merchants: 'My friend, do you not know that my subjects are a band of robbers and that I am their captain?'"

Money must not save the defendant from conviction. This argument occurs repeatedly in Cicero's opening speech. He cites the prevalent opinion that in the present courts no wealthy man, however guilty, can be convicted; that Verres boasts already of his acquittal (chap. 1), and his protection in money (chap. 3). Cicero lays bare Verres' plots to corrupt the court (chap. 3), and says that its decision will tell whether a wealthy man can be convicted (chap. 16). Burke's fear of the influence of wealth is based on its less direct, more insidious employment:² "It is well known that enormous wealth has poured into this country from India, through a thousand channels, public and concealed: and it is no particular derogation from our honor to suppose the possibility of being corrupted by that by which other empires have been corrupted." Or again:³ "We know that the private fortunes which have been made there pervade this kingdom so universally that

¹ *Speech in Opening, First Day.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Speech in Reply, First Day.*

there is not a single parish in it unoccupied by the partisans of the defendant."

Testimonials as to the character of the accused are the last resort of criminals, and they are of no value when obtained under constraint. Heius, whom Verres had robbed most shamefully, served as chief of the deputation which Verres caused to come from Messana to Rome to testify how well and kindly he had conducted his government. But on cross-examination, Heius acknowledged that he spoke in Verres' favor only because he had been forced to do so. Addressing Verres Cicero said (*Act. Sec. iv. 9*): "What sort of praise is that, when he who utters it, being questioned, is compelled to give answers injurious to him whom he is praising? Heius is an encomiast of yours, he has done you the most serious injury. I will bring forward the rest; they will gladly be silent about all that they are allowed to suppress; what they cannot help saying they will say unwillingly." Burke, commenting on the strange situation of panegyrics in Hastings' favor by the natives of Bengal, the anomaly of the prosecution pressing a charge and being disavowed by the very persons in whose name and character they bring the charges, exclaims:¹ "Oh, my Lords, consider the situation of a people who are forced to mix their praises with their groans, who are forced to sign, with hands which have been in torture, and with thumbscrews but just taken from them, an attestation in favor of the person from whom all their suffering has been derived!"

A criminal should find no escape from accusation, no defense in the erasure and suppression of public records, or in false entries therein. Verres attempted to have the public registers of Miletus destroyed. Cicero tells him that he is much mistaken if he thinks he has thereby escaped accusation (*Act. Sec. i. 35; cf. 61*): "For you have always fancied, and especially in Sicily, that you had taken sufficient precautions for your defense when you had either forbidden anything to be mentioned in the public records, or had compelled that which had been so mentioned to be erased. How vain that step is . . . you may learn again in the case of this city." Similarly, Burke, commenting on Hastings' efforts to

¹ *Speech on the Sixth Article, First Day.*

suppress, change, and destroy the records of the East India Company, his futile attempts to discredit and ruin what remains, adds:¹ "But I hope your Lordships will show the destroyers of those records, which are to be the securities against malversation in office, the discoverers and avengers of it, that whoever destroys the discoverer establishes the iniquity."

The corrupt receipt of money cannot be justified by the plea that it was not for the benefit of the recipient; this would be ruinous to all proceedings against extortion. Listen to Cicero (*Act. Sec. ii. 10*): "For if you, O judges, admit this defense 'He did not receive it himself,' you will put an end to all judicial proceedings for extortion. For no criminal will be brought before you so guilty as not to be able to avail himself of that plea." And to the very similar argument by Burke:² "If you sanction this practice . . . this shocking consequence will follow from it. If your governor is discovered in taking a bribe, he will say 'What is that to you? mind your own business; I intend it for the public service.' So that the minute the bribe is detected, it is instantly turned into a merit."

The laws of morality are the same everywhere. Condemning Verres' corrupt and inconsistent issuance of edicts governing inheritances, Cicero inquires whether Verres regards one thing as just in Rome and another in Sicily (*Act. Sec. i. 46*). Burke denying Hastings' singular defense that actions in Asia do not have the same moral qualities which the same actions would have in Europe says:³ "This geographical morality we do protest against . . . there is no action which would pass for an act of extortion, of peculation, of bribery, and of oppression in England, that is not an act of extortion, of peculation, of bribery and oppression in Europe, Asia, Africa, and in all the world."

He is basest of all base men who fails to measure up to "honor among thieves." Denouncing Verres as a judge, Cicero exclaims:⁴ "How much more wicked, flagitious, and scandalous is it to condemn a man when you have taken money to acquit him? so that the pretor does not observe even the custom of thieves in keeping

¹ *Speech in Opening, First Day.*

³ *Speech in Opening, Second Day.*

² *Speech in Opening, Third Day.*

⁴ *Act. Sec. ii. 32.*

good faith." So Burke:¹ "There is a fidelity even in bribery; there is a truth and observance even in corruption; there is a justice, that if money is to be paid for protection, protection should be given. . . . But your Lordships will find that the last act of Mr. Hastings' life [in India] was to be an accomplice in the most cruel and perfidious breach of faith . . . that I do believe was ever held out to the indignation of the world with regard to private persons."

There remains still a brief consideration of stylistic resemblances. In the use of the very common figures of anaphora, rhetorical question, asyndeton, etc., Burke shows a noticeable sympathy with Cicero's manner. In their use of antithesis, in the enhancing of the background, and in reinforcing the basis of a charge; in the effective amplification of awful and revolting details Cicero and Burke show such resemblances that it would seem the latter had been taught of the former. In the use of irony and withering sarcasm Cicero is the more extensive, yet Burke is not wanting in these particulars. In their use of oaths in exclamatory asseveration the two orators stand on an even footing, both as to relative frequency and as to the situations in which employed. Cicero's frequent *di immortales*, *O di immortales*, *per deos immortales*, *per deum hominum fidem* find a parallel in Burke's "Good God," "Merciful God," "Good Heavens," etc. Cicero is not easily surpassed in the use of vituperative epithet and description, numerous examples of which occur in the *Verrines*. To pass over the puns on Verres' name by which he is called now a "boar" (in allusion to his greedy, groveling nature), now a "broom," now a "drag-net" (in allusion to the way in which he swept out, dragged out, from his province everything of value) a characteristic description is that given of Apronius, more like Verres than any man in the province (*Act. Sec. iii. 9*): "who as he shows not only by his life, but by his person and countenance, is a vast whirlpool of every sort of vice and infamy. Him did Verres employ as chief agent in all his adulteries, in all his plundering of temples, in all his debauching banquets . . . though everyone else hated him, and could not bear the sight of him, Verres could not bear to be away

¹ *Speech in Opening, Fourth Day.*

from him; though others shunned the banquets at which Apronius was to be present, Verres used the same cup with him; lastly, though the odor of Apronius' breath and person is such that even, as one may say, the beasts cannot endure him, he appeared to Verres alone pleasant and agreeable." Burke is quite Cicero's equal in the following application to Hastings:¹ "Yet for years he lay down in that sty of disgrace, fattening in it, feeding upon that offal of disgrace and excrement, upon everything that could be disgusting to the human mind." Or in this:² "His is unlike the generous rapacity of the noble eagle, who preys upon a struggling, living, reluctant, equal victim; his is like that of the ravenous vulture, who falls upon the decayed, the sickly, the dying, and the dead, and only anticipates Nature in the destruction of its object."

Consideration of the facts presented above leaves scarcely a doubt that Burke was familiar with all the details of Verres' impeachment; that he modeled after the *Verrines*, imitating Cicero's speeches in order, in form, and in arguments; also that he was influenced by Cicero in matters of style.

¹ *Sixth Article*, Second Day.

² *Sixth Article*, First Day.

THE OLD AND THE NEW IN METRICS

BY RICHARD WELLINGTON HUSBAND
Dartmouth College

This brief paper has arisen out of a request for a review of the recent book on the meters of Greek comedy by Professor John Williams White of Harvard University.¹ It was proposed that I explain in the briefest manner the chief points of difference between the two schools of metrists now standing in such strong opposition to one another, and give examples of several kinds of verse as read by the two schools. Consequently the paper is something more than a formal review of Professor White's book, and something less than a critical examination. In reviewing the book recently Professor Shorey remarked that it contained "a perfectly lucid and intelligible account of a matter which perhaps it is no exaggeration to say that not more than two or three men in America or ten in Europe have hitherto understood." And that is undoubtedly true. Probably the majority of us gain our knowledge of meters from the introduction or appendix of the editions of classical poetry we are using with our classes, and accept without question the use of metrical and rhythmical terms by the editor. My plan, therefore, is to show the chief points in the discussion that is now shaking to its foundations the whole science of meter and rhythm.

Of course, Professor White had for his aim only the explanation of the meters and rhythms of Greek comedy, but he was forced into a somewhat extended account of his metrical doctrine in general. In the introduction he gives a summary review of the most striking developments in metrical science. There he shows that the discussion of the nineteenth century largely arose through Hermann's attempt to rhythmize the Glyconic. Now the Glyconic in Latin is a very simple octosyllabic verse, - - - - - - - -, e.g., *Sic te diva potens Cypri*, but in Greek poetry, even of the fifth century, the first two syllables are still unregulated, and may

¹ *The Verse of Greek Comedy*. Macmillan, 1912.

appear in the forms --, - -, - -, - -. Hermann considered the two unregulated syllables as unrhythmical, composed of two theses. The true meter of the Glyconic began with the third syllable, and had a choriamb (- - - -) as its chief characteristic. This meant the recognition of a tetrasyllabic foot, and so Hermann read also the lesser and the greater Asclepiadean, e.g., *O fons Bandusiae, splendidior vitro*, or ἡλθες ἐκ περάτων γὰς ἐλαφαντίαν (- - - - - - - - - -), ὥραν οὐκ ἀπολείς οὐδ' ἀπολήψει (- - - - - - - - - -); *tu ne quaesieris, scire nefas, quem mihi, quem tibi . . .*, or ὄρνυθες τίνες οἷδ' οὐδὲν ἔχοντες περοποίκιλοι (- - - - - - - - - -).

But the successors of Hermann would not accept the choriambic foot, and Apel "came upon the 'cyclic' dactyl" (- - -). This is the beginning of what White terms the "logaoedic school," a school which made extensive use of the cyclic dactyl as the equivalent of the trochee, and rendered much of Greek lyric poetry in logaoedic fashion. Yet this is a decided break with the teachings of the Greek and Roman writers on metric and music, who readily admitted many forms of tetrasyllabic foot, e.g., - - - -, - - - -, - - - -, - - - -. However, the logaoedists gradually gained sway, "predisposed to the rhythms of modern poetry and music." Consequently White, not inaptly, calls these rhythmists "new," in contrast with himself and others of the past fifteen years who follow more fully Aristoxenus, Heliodorus, and other good rhythmists. He repudiates the name "new" as applied to Gleditsch, Weil, Blass, Schroeder, von Wilamowitz, Masqueray, and himself. He feels that the systems of scansion adopted in practically all of our textbooks of the dramatic and lyric poets is an abandonment of the true course. He was himself guilty of going astray when he translated Dr. J. H. H. Schmidt's *Introduction to the Rhythmic and Metric of the Classical Languages*, and regards the present book as a palinode. *Iterare cursus cogor relictos*. It is a kind of "back-to-the-soil" movement. To designate this movement I shall borrow the expression "modern school" from Professor Goodell.

The following are the principles of the logaoedic, or orthodox school, of those, namely, whose theories are the current ones of today. It is of course to be noted that not all of the supporters of

the current doctrines subscribe to all of these principles, but closer specification would carry me beyond my allotted space.

1. The thesis of every foot was marked by a stress-ictus. This was affirmed or tacitly assumed by practically all writers. Real argument on the subject has been chiefly confined to America. Professors Bennett and Goodell have argued at length and with great learning that stress did not exist, and are followed by White, who says: "Quantity, inherent in the language and fixed in almost all syllables, is the solid foundation on which Greek rhythms with their varied orderings of 'times' are based." Elaborate replies have been made to these views by Professors Hale, Hendrickson, and Shorey. But the lines are not drawn strictly between the two schools, for Gleditsch, otherwise close to White, assumes a stress-ictus, while Goodell, leaning decidedly toward the logaoedic school, argues against it. It is claimed that there is no ancient evidence whatever that stress-ictus existed, but that it is a "modern invention" applied to Greek and Latin verse, through the influence of modern verse which is inconceivable without stress upon the thesis. The reply is made that hints of its existence are found in Dionysius Hal., and that it is of necessity inherent in every rhythm, and at the beginning of each rhythmical sequence. The argument against the existence of stress is rather stronger for Greek than for Latin. Professor White thinks that the insistence upon the regular recurrence of stress is largely responsible for the enormous enlargement of the place earlier assigned to logaoedics. But it has not yet been made clear to me that this is a point that can reasonably separate the two schools.

2. No normal simple foot contains more than three syllables. The feet commonly recognized in our textbooks and editions are: \sim , $\sim\sim$, $\sim\sim\sim$, $\sim\sim\sim\sim$, $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$, $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$, $\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim$. To these may be added the proceleusmatic ($\sim\sim\sim\sim$), formed by the resolution of a trisyllabic foot. On this point the two schools part company most emphatically. The Greek and Roman metrists recognized the choriamb ($\sim\sim\sim\sim$), the antispast ($\sim\sim\sim\sim$), the major ionic ($\sim\sim\sim\sim$), the minor ionic ($\sim\sim\sim\sim$), and other feet. A consistent scansion of lyrics and choruses as logaoedics necessarily does away with all of these tetrasyllabic feet. But few advanced to the extent

- - - -, where the first two syllables constitute the thesis, and the second two the arsis. The significance and effect of this difference of treatment will become clear later, as will also the effect of the recognition or non-recognition of tetrasyllabic feet in general.

3. All feet must begin with the thesis, a stressed long syllable. If the normal long syllable of the thesis is resolved, one of the short syllables into which it is resolved will be stressed, e.g., - - becomes - - -. This is what we find readily enough in a series of dactyls or trochees, e.g.:

Hoc iter ignavi divisimus, altius ac nos
Praecinctis unum; minus est gravis Appia tardis.

or:

εἰπέ μοι τί μέλλομεν κι-
νεῖν ἐκείνην τὴν χολήν
ἥνπερ ἦνικ' ἄν τις ἡμῶν
ὀργίσῃ τὴν σφηκιάν;

But this system gets rid absolutely of the iambus, the anapaest, the lesser ionic, and the antispast. A series of iambs becomes merely a series of trochees with anacrusis. This doctrine is, apparently, responsible for the assumption of the existence of anacrusis. So far as I am aware, anacrusis is not mentioned by an ancient metrist, but is an "invention" of Hermann. By this system an "iambic trimeter" becomes a "trochaic trimeter catalectic with anacrusis." So a series of anapaests becomes a series of dactyls with anacrusis and catalexis. The names are still retained, but indicate only the presence of anacrusis. The modern school seeks to show that "periods in ascending rhythm," that is, those in which the arsis precedes the thesis, developed prior to the development of periods in descending rhythm, and that the latter arose from the former by a process of acephalization. It is said that Hermann's "theory of 'anacrusis,' applied to periods in ascending rhythm, obscures real differences." Professor Goodell had declared that the eleven-syllabled Alcaic is identical with the eleven-syllabled Sapphic, except for a prefixed arsis.

Before giving examples to show the different methods of reading such verses, I shall briefly summarize Professor White's view of the constitution of the iambic trimeter. The metrical unit is a series of four syllables, of which the second and fourth are normally long.

A variation arises only if one of these long syllables is resolved into two short syllables. The first of the four syllables is much more likely to become subject to change. This finds its explanation in the fact that in this group of four syllables long syllables early became established for the second and fourth places, while the first and third remained unregulated. They might be long, or short, or be omitted altogether. Gradually a short syllable became normal for the third place. If we consider the first and second as together constituting the arsis, and the third and fourth as constituting the thesis, we are led up to two of Professor White's favorite rules. These are: (a) the integrity of the thesis must be quantitatively maintained, and (b) the arsis is normally variable, and may be extremely variable. This accounts for the fact that the second, fourth, and sixth feet of the trimeter never allowed the substitution of the spondee or dactyl.

The following are the quantitative possibilities in the twelve places in an iambic trimeter:



A glance at this scheme shows instantly what is meant by the integrity of the thesis (second, fourth, and sixth feet) and the variability of the arsis (first, third, and fifth feet).

For example Arist. *Eccl.* 266 ff.:

χαλεπὸν τὸ πρᾶγμ'· ὁμως δὲ χειροτονητέον
ἐξωμιάσας τὸν ἕτερον βραχίονα.
ἀγε νῦν ἀναστέλλεσθ' αἶνω τὰ χιτῶνια·
ὑποδέσθε δ' ὡς τάχιστα τὰς Λακωνικάς,
ώσπερ τὸν ἀνδρ' ἐθεᾶσθ', ὅτ' εἰς ἐκκλησίαν
μέλλει βαδίζειν ἢ θύραζ' ἐκάστοτε

These verses would be scanned by the logaoedic, or orthodox, school:



dactyl which must be pronounced rapidly enough to occupy the time ordinarily occupied in the pronunciation of a trochee. But scarcely any two modern logaoedists are in agreement as to the method to be adopted in compressing this dactyl. Are all three syllables to be shortened, but the proper proportion of long and short syllables, namely, two to one, to be maintained? Is the third syllable normal, but the first and second shortened to occupy the time of a single long? Is a new relation to be established among all three? It was also pointed out above that there is scarcely a hint in any ancient writer of the very existence of such a foot. Professor Goodell here stands with the modern school, and refuses to recognize such a foot. Yet he scans the verse as logaoedic, but unites with the modern school in explaining that if a dactyl takes the place of a trochee it exemplifies merely the general principle of the variability of the arsis. There is a slight irregularity in the tempo of the colon. The Sapphic strophe does not occur in Greek comedy, so its scansion is not given by White. It is scanned by Gleditsch as follows:

Ποικιλόθρον' ἀθάνατ' Ἀφροδίτα,
παῖ Δίος, δολόπλοκε, λίσσομαί σε,
μή μ' ἄσαισι μήτ' ὀνίαισι δάμνα,
πότνια, θυμόν.
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘

A more striking illustration of the differences between the two schools is seen in the Alcaic strophe:

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum
Soracte, nec iam sustineant onus
Silvae laborantes geluque
Flumina constiterint acuto.

Ἀσυνέτημι τῶν ἀνέμων στάσιν·
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔνθεν κῆμα κυλίνδεται,
τὸ δ' ἔνθεν ἄμμες δ' ἂν τὸ μέσσον
ναῖ φορήμεθα σὺν μελαίνα.

This is scanned by Gleditsch:

˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘
 ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ | ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ ˘

ἡδιστον φάος ἡμέρας [Arist. *Eq.* 973-76].

ἔσται τοῖσι παρόνσι καὶ

τοῖς ἀποῦσιν, ἰκνουμένως

ἦν Κλέων ἀπόληται.

---	---
---	---
---	---
---	---

The scansion on the lesser Asclepiadean by the modern school introduces the antispast (---), a foot which above all others the logaoedic school will not tolerate. Thus Professor Goodell says: "We cannot believe that such a combination of syllables was a real foot in the Aristoxenean sense, a foot employed continuously, by which the character of the rhythm was marked and made intelligible." A part of the reply by Professor White is to show that Swinburne has successfully used the choriamb, and that Professor Gilbert Murray has composed verses in antispasts, believing that this was in Sappho's manner.

We are now in position to formulate some of the positive features of the doctrines of the modern school: (1) a tendency to assume quadrisyllabic measures, or feet, as the unit; (2) the uniform avoidance of anacrusis; (3) the rare use of protraction; (4) the maintenance of the natural quantity of the long syllable of the thesis; (5) the assumption of extreme variability of the arsis, leading to the recognition of differences in the length of the feet composing a verse, or period.

The grounds for these rules (the wording is mine, they are nowhere summarized), cannot be given in brief. One must read Professor White's chapter entitled "Origin of the Forms of Greek Poetry." The actual gains of the modern school to the present are not so much the recognition of this or that point, but rather that their opponents are studying the ancient rhythmists with greater attention. It will also without doubt compel a recognition of the necessity for adopting the historical and comparative method in these investigations.

REFLECTIONS OF A NON-COMBATANT

BY H. C. NUTTING
University of California

The discussion now centering around the question of the feasibility of teaching Latin by the direct method in American public schools seems likely to bring substantial benefits in its train, even though the experiments now being made may not prove as successful as some teachers hope and predict. But it certainly will be a serious misfortune if allegiance to one method or another shall in any way divide our forces into opposing camps. The cause of all Latin teachers, whatever the method pursued, is one and the same; and the forces of the enemy are so strong and aggressive that we cannot afford to risk any disruption in our own ranks.

There may be little real danger of such disruption, but enthusiastic advocacy of some one method of teaching very naturally and insidiously runs over into depreciation of all others. This point may be illustrated from the recent paper of Mr. Chickering in the *Classical Journal*.¹ As a whole, the article is temperate and fair; but, in speaking of the change of method incident to the decay of Latin as a spoken language, Mr. Chickering says: "the whole substance of the prevailing methods [of learning the language] was swept away, and what remained *was believed to have value partly because it was hard, partly because it was disagreeable*."² And elsewhere he speaks of teaching Latin "in the old humdrum fashion."³

It is clear that our methods of teaching Latin are in need of reform, but such a result surely can be attained without playing into the hands of the enemy in this way. The bitter opponent of the study of Latin will certainly be delighted to be able to quote a Latin teacher to the effect that "what remained was believed to have value partly because it was hard, partly because it was disagreeable"; for, on the surface, this statement seems to fit splen-

¹ IX, 2 (November, 1913), 67 ff.

² P. 70. Italics mine.

³ *Classical Weekly*, VI, 5 (November 2, 1912), 35.

didly with the late "discovery" that discipline has no legitimate place in education, and that the proper way to train a child is to study his likes and dislikes, and then gently help him along the line of least resistance.

As a matter of fact, of course, Mr. Chickering's words are not meant to imply that learning Latin by the direct method is an easy matter. On this point Mr. Andrew is very explicit in the introduction to *Primus Annus*. He says: "One sometimes hears teachers say that the direct method makes a foreign language easy; such men betray themselves when they say so, for anybody who has seriously tried it knows that the new method is far more exacting, for teacher and learner alike, than the old." Whatever the method of approach, the acquisition of a knowledge of Latin is bound, in most cases, to be difficult; and it is well that it should be so. All educational fads and fancies to the contrary, the age-long experience of the race has inscribed deeply (for him who will but read) the lesson that character and the power to accomplish results are gained by meeting and overcoming difficulties, not by dodging them; and it is just as true that often no greater kindness can be shown a child than to hold him even by force, if necessary, to a course of action the value of which he is not mature enough to appreciate. Hear the following word of testimony:¹

"Among the early jottings in the diary of a boy occurs this passage:

'I cannot pretend to like this school, however much I try. The head is a beast, and not one of the under-masters is a decent chap. I hate being kept in after hours when the other fellows are going out to games, yet, whenever I haven't done a lesson right, they make me do it until I know it thoroughly. This is constantly the case with my Latin. Also, I do loathe the food they give us; we have to eat fat and lean together and fat is beastly. Also, however cold it is, we have to take long runs, when it would be much nicer to sit by the fire and be comfortable. I can't understand my father and mother, who say they love me and all that, sending me to such a place and making me learn Latin and Euclid, which are no use to anyone. I wish I could run away.'

Just fifty years later the same hand wrote these words, when the writer's name was known throughout the world:

'Of my many advantages in early life, I place easily first my parents, whose particular method of training me was beyond all words of praise. . . .

¹ Quoted from J. M. Blake, *A Reasonable View of Life*. London: James Clarke & Co.

To my puerile mind they seemed, I remember, somewhat cruelly strict. But I see now how marvelously they understood me, at a time when I was very far from understanding myself. . . . In looking back upon my first school, I can think of it only with affection, for the manner in which the masters treated my inert tendency of character was entirely admirable. To their insistence at that period I owe one of the keenest delights of my maturer years, a love for the Latin authors. Had they at all given in to my laziness, I cannot doubt that it would have quickly become a fixed habit of my mind. . . . In the matter of physical soundness also, I am certainly much indebted to the school runs which were compulsory and to the wholesome and sensible diet on which we were fed, without which I should not possess today the virility which has kept me free from disease to a quite unusual extent.'"

Let it be freely and frankly admitted, therefore, that, by any method, Latin is a difficult subject. Things really worth while are worth striving for; and here is a hill Difficulty with a glorious outlook to reward those who have the grit and perseverance to push on to the summit. Far from attempting an apology, teachers of Latin should glory in the fact that theirs is a subject which puts no premium upon laziness and indifference.

From a perusal of articles written on the direct method it would seem that the chief merit claimed for it is that it so stimulates and holds the pupil's interest that he submits to the drill necessary to the realization of the supreme aim of all our Latin instruction, namely, the development of power to read with facility and appreciation the works of the great Roman writers. Professor Kirtland¹ has pointed out some of the reasons why the use of the direct method may not be feasible in American schools generally. It is not to be expected that his arguments will carry conviction to the minds of all, and we can well afford to wait patiently the outcome of the experiment being tried by Mr. Chickering and others, it being understood that the success of the direct method is to be judged, not by the pupil's fluency in talking about things that may be visualized in the classroom, but by his power to read and translate accurately pieces of classical Latin previously unseen.

The fact that American students begin their Latin so late, and have usually but four (or even two) years to devote to the subject, is a very serious complication; and we are far from being in a posi-

¹ *Classical Journal*, VIII, 9 (June, 1913), 355 ff.

tion to burn our bridges behind us. And though it be freely admitted that the methods of Latin instruction are in many localities in dire need of reform, it does not by any means follow that the cause is lost if the direct method fails to provide the solution of our difficulty. Experiments now being tried along very different lines are showing abundantly that the interest and enthusiasm aroused by the use of the direct method can be inspired and sustained by a system of instruction which is more economical of time and which does not set teacher and class adrift so far beyond the sight of known landmarks.

Book Reviews

Roman Farm Management. The Treatises of Cato and Varro Done into English, with Notes of Modern Instances, by a Virginia Farmer. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xii+365. \$2.00 net.

The editor of this volume is a graduate of Yale University and his vocation is that of a railroad president. His avocation is farming. He made the acquaintance of Cato and Varro several years ago while "standing at a book stall on the Quai Voltaire in Paris, and they carried him away in imagination, during a pleasant half-hour, not to the vineyards and olive yards of Roman Italy, but to the blue hills of a far-distant Virginia where the corn was beginning to tassel and the fat cattle were loafing in the pastures."

In a digression, quite in the manner of Cato, the reviewer would like to remark that this fact alone causes him much pleasure. For twenty-five years he has been faithfully trying to teach Latin, but he fears that his students have been few, who, many years after graduation, could take up a copy of Cato, or of Varro, and read it with pleasure for a half-hour, or even read it at all so as to get anything out of it, for the difficulties of these authors are everywhere acknowledged. Yet here is a college graduate, whose life has been successfully devoted to business, not simply able to amuse himself by *reading* Cato and Varro, but also to publish an important translation of these authors, with abundant and scholarly notes.

The translator followed up his half-hour's acquaintance of these two Roman agronomists and he quickly discovered that no adequate and available English versions of their works existed. The earlier translations are not merely a century old, but they were made by men who were apparently unacquainted with the diction of their authors. Therefore "a Virginia Farmer" set about the delightful task of rendering the works of Cato and of Varro really accessible to English readers, and in 1910 he published a very charming little book, entitled *Cato's Farm Management*.

Cato's almost complete lack of method in arranging his material is only too well known. "A certain effort at arrangement may be traced through a considerable portion, but the remainder has all the flavor of an old-time book of receipts, with the same lack of logical sequence" (Frank Gardner Moore). For the purpose of making a readable edition of Cato's book the translator decided, "at the risk of anathema," to arrange Cato's material in proper order and to omit "most of those portions which are now of merely curious interest." This means that many passages of Cato's one extant work are not here given in translation.

The present volume of xii+365 pages is the outgrowth of the earlier book. In this is given almost without change the material of *Cato's Farm Management*, together with a complete translation of Varro's *Rerum Rusticarum Libri Tres*. A few of the notes originally given in connection with the translations from Cato now appear in the part of the book devoted to Varro, while a few more sections of Cato are translated and many of the notes are largely amplified, being made at once more valuable and interesting. For example, the edition of 1910 ended with "A Virginia Recipe for Curing Hams." To this is now added "A Virginia Recipe for Cooking Hams," with the postscript: "To be thoroughly appreciated a ham should be carved on the table, by a pretty woman. A thick slice of ham is a crime against good breeding."

The translator expressly wishes to lay no claim to scholarship and to anticipate possible criticism he quotes Bentley's "a very pretty poem, Mr. Pope, but don't call it Homer." The reviewer has carefully read the whole volume and compared many portions of it with the Latin of the original. He is happy to say that he has found the translation very accurate and expressed in most excellent and spirited English. It is not the sort of translation that a school boy would want to serve as a lexicon and to save wear and tear on his brain in putting his assignment into "English." If a good translation is the best commentary on an author's works, this is an admirable commentary. It cannot fail to bring pleasure and profit to all who could be interested in the subject. To the present reviewer, who has read and enjoyed Cato, even with all his ruggedness and fondness for digressions, as well as Varro, with his peculiar and archaic diction, the book has proved most fascinating. "This is a delightful book, the ripe product of a gentleman and a scholar," as the editor himself says of Harte's *Essays on Husbandry*.

The volume is intended for "those who love the country, and to read about the country amidst the crowded life of towns." It will also serve as a handbook of practical rules covering most things which even today are connected with agriculture.

O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint,
agricolas!

Here they will find safe and sane directions for selecting and buying a farm, and also for building the house and barns. There are rules for ploughing and sowing, as well as for gathering the crop into the barns. The kind of soil and cultivation necessary for the production of nearly all cereals, vegetables, and fruits, except a few like maize and potatoes, are explained in detail. The various animals of value to the farmer are discussed in their proper order. The "points" of each and the best method of breeding are described. Then, too, the modern farmer will without doubt be astonished to learn that our self-binding harvester had as a direct ancestor a Gallic header, which is described by Varro, Pliny, and Palladius.

Moreover, the value of the book is greatly increased by the excellent notes. For these the editor has delved deeply into the works of all the Greek and

Roman writers on farming, including Hesiod, Xenophon, Aristotle, Pliny, Columella, Palladius and the *Geoponica*. There are also notes from old and rare English books on the subject and occasionally from other more modern sources. In some cases one might wish that more notes had been given, since the editor had the material so easily at his command. Many more quotations from Vergil might have been used in the body of the book, where they would have been of interest at least to the general reader. On page 250 the reviewer would have given a reference even to Kipling's story, "The Cat That Walked by Himself."

Moreover, the editor is a practical farmer. The notes in which are described customs and practices prevailing in various sections of this country form an important part of the work.

There is a good introduction on the lives and writings of the two authors, and an article of four pages in length giving a list of those passages in which Vergil was clearly under obligation to Varro.

The volume is a distinct contribution to classical scholarship and also to the literature readily accessible to the intelligent farmer. The reviewer wishes it a wide circulation among scholars, farmers, and others. Even to the modern giver of luncheons and afternoon teas in her brain-racking search for "new" and wonderful concoctions the book should prove a real blessing. How many, for example, have ever tried this recipe for must cake? "Sprinkle a peck of wheat flour with must. Add anise, cumin, two pounds of lard, a pound of cheese and shredded laurel twigs. When you have kneaded the dough, put laurel leaves over it and so bake." Who knows but that shredded laurel twigs are as appetizing and nutritious as shredded cocoanut? Also, the silver-tongued campaign orator, who wishes to prove that we have no reason to complain about the increase in the cost of living, may find here some facts of value to his argument. Do all of our economists know that at Rome in the first century before Christ an egg of a pea fowl sold for \$1.00, and a pea fowl itself for \$10.00? At that time a pair of pigeons sold for \$10.00, \$50.00, and even \$80.00, while later the price advanced to \$200.00! Thrushes, also, sold for 60 cents a piece.

The book is printed on excellent paper, with the headings of the pages and a few initials in red. The binding is in imitation vellum, with the title printed in gold, making a book unusually attractive in appearance.

The reviewer hopes that the translator will soon give us an equally valuable edition of the works of Columella.

M. N. WETMORE

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

Stoics and Sceptics. By EDWYN BEVAN. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Pp. 152.

Greek scholarship in England has in recent years been usefully, but perhaps excessively, preoccupied with the study of primitive religion in the ancient

world. Such investigation has thrown welcome light on obscure features of the imaginative literature and the art of Greece, and has contributed valuable data to anthropological science; but a book like Mr. Bevan's *Stoics and Sceptics* shows that there is still room for study and exposition of the mature speculation of the Greeks on the origin and destiny of the world and on the appropriate direction of human conduct. The theories which Mr. Bevan discusses arose in an age whose complexity resembles that of modern times more than any other period of antiquity; its doubts and difficulties were not unlike our own. Mr. Bevan explains and criticizes the Stoic and Sceptic doctrines with an appreciation of historical conditions and a freshness and incisiveness of style which we have learned to expect in English work.

The first of the four lectures presents vividly the personality of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school, a teacher of Semitic origin who made the forms of Greek logic the vehicle for something of the earnestness and vehemence of an eastern prophet. The main motive of Stoicism was practical: the provision of some deliverance from the dominion of fear and desire over the individual life. But the Stoic rule required justification in a theory of the universe, and this in turn demanded a theory of knowledge. The strength and weakness of Stoic epistemology and metaphysics are discussed in the second lecture, together with the ingenious doctrine by which the conduct of the Stoic wise man was governed. The third lecture is devoted to the modification which the teaching of Zeno and Chrysippus underwent at the hands of Posidonius and other eclectic philosophers at the end of the Hellenistic period; the fusion of Stoicism with mystical doctrine, derived mainly from Platonic and Pythagorean sources. The Sceptic criticism of the dogmatic theories of which Stoicism was the most important in late Greek and Roman times is discussed in the last lecture. The logical flaws of any system of dogma were easily pointed out by the Sceptics. But whatever might be its speculative value, Sceptic philosophy was practically a failure, because of its entirely negative character. It contained no guidance for action in a world where action is continually demanded, and for this reason its opposition to Christianity proved hopelessly ineffective.

Mr. Bevan's book is unusually free from technicalities and will attract many readers who are repelled by some of the more formal treatises on Greek philosophy.

SIDNEY N. DEANE

SMITH COLLEGE

Collected Studies in Greek and Latin Scholarship. By A. W. VERRALL. Edited by M. A. BAYFIELD and J. D. DUFF. Cambridge University Press, 1913. Pp. vi+376.

The late Mr. Verrall was certainly not without honor in his own country; the present volume is one of many indications of the esteem in which he was

held by his friends and pupils. Others who did not come into contact with his brilliant and engaging personality are perhaps less competent to pass upon the merits of his contributions to classical scholarship. This collection of his minor papers includes about twenty short articles already published, and five papers (though the editors in the preface promise six) hitherto unpublished. Of the former only the essay on Tyrtæus which opens the volume seems to us at all important; it illustrates Mr. Verrall's fresh, keen, stimulating rehandling of old material; his skeptical attitude toward data on the lives of authors in the early periods of Greek literature has become rather general since the essay was written.

The new papers deal with a lost word in Homer (*ἀνὰκτος*, "unbroken"), a metrical jest in Catullus (xiv. 22), a vexed passage in Horace (*Carm.* i. 6. 17-18), the story of Orpheus and Eurydice in Vergil's fourth *Georgic*, and the apparent confusion of Philippi and Pharsalia. His study of Horace, *Carm.* i. 6 is characteristic: by the interpreter's magic power the *proelia virginum* become *proelia nuptiarum*, the "pared nails" an important part of the marriage ritual, and ultimately we have Horace asserting that *convivia* (Mr. Verrall prefers *convicia*) and *proelia Veneris* are the typical themes of the poet of love. Pertinent as the parallel in Propertius ii. 1. 45 seems to be, the reader is left somewhat dazzled by the author's cleverness and ingenuity but quite unconvinced of the sanity and inevitability of his conclusions; and this, in general, is the impression Mr. Verrall makes throughout the volume.

H. W. P.

History of Psychology. A Sketch and an Interpretation. By JAMES MARK BALDWIN. New York and London: Putnams, 1913. 2 vols. Pp. x+168 and v+214. \$1.50.

This work appears as one of a series of brief handbooks entitled, "A History of the Sciences." Coming from the pen of so eminent a savant, this history of psychology commands attention, not only from specialists in the field, but also from those who make psychology a *πάρεργον*. To the uses of the latter group of students the book is almost perfectly adapted, since it gives in concise form and, we may feel certain, with accurate selection all necessary desiderata.

As the author states in the preface, the work is a sketch, and as such it should be regarded. Possibly for this reason and the frank statement of this fact, the volumes are the more useful to the general reader and less specializing student. On the other hand, Dr. Baldwin can seek covert in the admission if the more expert critics whose judgment he courts should indicate errors or challenge authorities.

The chief sources of the work are: Dessoir, *Abriss einer Geschichte der Psychologie*; Harms, *Die Philosophie in ihrer Geschichte, I. Psychologie*; and the author's own important contributions of recent years. In the list of "secondary sources"—the "primary sources" are the treatises of the psycholo-

gists themselves—one misses the name Zeller, and one is surprised to find Windelband, Höffding, and Erdmann relegated to a footnote. Such a work as Höffding's *History of Mediaeval and Modern Philosophy* should be especially useful in the making of briefer handbooks; his exposition of the theories of the mediaeval psychologists is most suggestive in tracing the connection of the mystics and empiricists with the post-Aristotelians. Fairbanks', *The First Philosophers of Greece*, and Ritter and Preller's, *Historia Philosophiae Graecae* are valuable source-books for the pre-Socratics. Dr. Baldwin dismisses Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, with the remark in a footnote (I, 84), "The great poem, *De rerum natura*, of the Roman poet Lucretius, presents in not too faithful form the philosophy of Epicurus." This statement is misleading; the poem is a most important textbook of Epicureanism; the reader should be directed to become acquainted with it at first hand or in translation; the influence of Lucretius upon Bruno, Gassendi, and Leibnitz should not be entirely overlooked.

While Dr. Baldwin's field is not ancient philosophy, his treatment of the three periods of Greek speculation is full enough for general purposes and should be of great service as a source of accurate information in brief compass. The titles of the three chapters, "Projectivism," "Subjectivism," "Objectivism," are admirable; the early Greek physicist projected himself into the greater cosmos in his search for truth; the Socratic looked within himself for the subjective truth; the Aristotelian seeks light from the objective realities about him.

The two volumes are almost equally divided between "ancient" and "modern" psychology; the cleavage being at John Locke. On the volume of modern psychology the classicist hesitates to pass judgment; beyond a doubt, however, one may see that the author is more at home in the later than in the earlier fields. The closing chapter is, as it should be, a helpful historical résumé, while the strongest chapter in the whole work is the one immediately preceding, in which the writer shows the bearing of the successive epochs in the history of psychology upon the progress of modern individual thought.

The books are well made and are attractive in form and appearance; the text is greatly enhanced by reproductions of portraits of renowned psychologists. The entire work is of a character which should make it very serviceable to all students of the development of thought, and it is well worthy a place in the *Argiletum* of the classical philologist.

HERBERT P. HOUGHTON

AMHERST COLLEGE

The Golden Asse of Apuleius, Adlington's Translation. With an Introduction by THOMAS SECCOMBE. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1913. \$4.00. (Edition limited to 1,150 copies.)

This handsome volume is a careful reprint of the first edition of Adlington's translation, "The xi Bookes of the Golden Asse, . . . Translated out

of Latine into Englishe by William Adlington. Imprinted at London in Fleetstreete, at the figure of the Oliphante, by Henty Wykes. Anno 1566." No pains have been spared to make the transcription accurate. The type is beautifully clear and the paper the best of heavy linen. The engraved title-page of the Amsterdam edition of 1624 is reproduced.

Adlington's translation has become a classic. Faulty and inaccurate, its quaintness and piquancy of expression give to Apuleius' wonderful tale a charm which no twentieth-century prose could have. It is quite beside the point to object that the original never had such a charm. But Adlington is a rare book to be found only in large libraries and the hoards of collectors. The present edition is intended to make it more accessible. It must be said, however, that an edition limited to 1,150 copies will accomplish very little in this way.

The rambling and ill-written introduction is not worthy of a place in this book.

LOUIS E. LORD

OBERLIN COLLEGE

Geisteswissenschaften Verlagsverzeichnis. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, October, 1913.

This is the new and complete catalogue of all the books published by B. G. Teubner. Founded by Benedict Gotthelf Teubner in February, 1811, this firm has long been one of the world's greatest publishing houses and notably devoted to the production of editions of the classics. It issues also scholarly works in great numbers on many other subjects, for example, philosophy, psychology, religion, and oriental philology.

Every instructor, in school or in college, can find in this catalogue the titles of many editions of the authors he is teaching and also of volumes of importance in connection with these authors. There are few extant works of the Greek and Latin writers, those of little fame as well as those of greatest renown, that do not appear, at least in text form, among the Teubner books. Moreover, much care is taken frequently to revise all of the editions in the light of the latest and best scholarship. We should note, too, that the prices of the Teubner editions are extremely reasonable. It is a pleasure to discover one thing the price of which has not been recently advanced!

The catalogue itself is a book of real interest and value.

M. N. W.

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

The Verse of Greek Comedy. By JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE. New York: Macmillan, 1912. Pp. 479. \$4.00.

See article by Richard Wellington Husband, "The Old and the New in Metrics," in the present number of the *Journal*, p. 212.